DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 724 EA 012 855

AUTHOR Reinhard, Diane L.; And Others
TITLE Great Expectations: The Principal's Role and Inservice Needs in Supporting Change Projects.
PUB DATE 7 Apr 80
NOTE 20p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980). Not available in paper copy due to light print of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Behavior; Case Studies; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Education; Literature Reviews; *Participation; *Principals; *Programs

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a study conducted to identify principals' behaviors that supported or hindered externally funded change projects in their schools. The study also attempted to discover conceptions of needs, problems, and opportunities for inservice training for principals who manage such projects and to recommend content and delivery modes of inservice education to assist principals in administering successful projects. Methodology included interviews with 21 principals, 16 staff, and 42 teachers. The interviews were then written up into case studies. Results showed that some involvement by the principal is essential in school change projects. Such involvement signals to others that the project is viewed as an important part of the school's program. The paper suggests that staff development efforts should be responsive to local conditions and individualized to a specific principal's abilities. In addition, the principal should be treated as a colleague who is capable of describing his or her inservice needs, and the trainer should provide experiences that respond to those stated needs. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189724

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

GREAT EXPECTATIONS: THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE AND INSERVICE NEEDS IN SUPPORTING CHANGE PROJECTS

American Educational Research Association
National Meeting,
Boston, Massachusetts,
April 7, 1980

Diane L. Reinhard
Richard A. Arends
William Kutz
Katherine Lovell
Spencer Wyant
(all) University of Oregon

EA 012 855

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. L. Reinhard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

I. Introduction and Purpose of Study

The spotlight is on the principal in popular magazines as well as in the professional literature. The March 13, 1978 issue of Newsweek reported a national study of 1,600 principals, conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, which described the changing and sometimes contradictory expectations of the principal's role. Most principals, the article noted, face major role conflicts. A number of recent national studies directly or indirectly point to the importance of the principal's influence on the success of efforts to improve schools. The National Institute of Education recently funded a series of case studies to examine the role of principals. In short, there is a renewed interest in the function and influence of the principal in the American school system.

This renewed interest in the principal's role in initiating and sustaining change in schools is also evident in the recent professional literature. Studies of federally-funded projects, curriculum change, and organization development, as well as descriptive and normative theoretical statements, emphasize the principal's influence. Yet few reports specifically identify behaviors of principals that help or hinder change efforts; fewer still describe inservice education content or delivery modes that would aid principals in managing change.

Purposes of this study--conducted under a grant from the National Teacher Corps--were to identify principals' behaviors that supported or hindered externally-funded change projects in their schools; to discover conceptions of needs, problems, and opportunities for inservice training for principals who manage such projects; and to recommend content and delivery modes of inservice education to assist principals in administering successful projects.

II. Literature Review

The literature from three related fields was surveyed: (1) educational change literature with particular focus on the role of principal, (2) educational administration literature with emphasis on the role of the principal in general, and (3) literature describing needs assessments of principals and what have been identified as staff development opportunities important in helping them learn to perform their roles more efficiently. A summary of the literature review results are presented within each of these fields.

A. FINDINGS FROM PRIOR STUDIES OF EXTERNALLY FUNDED CHANGE EFFORTS

Review of Curriculum Change. Fullan and Pomfret (1976) reviewed research related to curriculum implementation for the National Institute of Education. From a search of ERIC files and dissertation abstracts, they identified twenty-seven studies conducted since 1970 that addressed issues of implementation of new school practices. These studies point out that most efforts were unsuccessful and that issues relating to implementation (actual use) were not considered as thoroughly as those associated with adoption (intended use).

Even though Fullan and Pomfret do not go into specifics about the role of the principal in this change process, they do, in numerous instances, refer to the importance of administrative support if change efforts are to be successful.

The Rand Studies. Under sponsorship of the U.S. Office of Education, the Rand Corporation in 1975 concluded a multi-year investigation of federally-funded change programs. Surveys of 293 projects and 29 case studies were conducted on change programs funded under Title III--Innovative Projects, Title VII, Bilingual projects, Vocational Education Act's Exemplary programs, and Right-to-Read programs. The Rand researchers (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975; Mann, 1976) reported that the projects which accomplished the least were redirected or subverted by the principal. Projects which were unsuccessful directly challenged the principal's leadership role and tried to move teachers away from practices sanctioned by the principal. Endorsement and active support by principals were almost always necessary for success.

Project on Social Architecture in Education. This recent NIE study by Matthew Miles examined the creation of new schools. One school deemed successful by the "project architects" described the principal's social support of parents and teachers as crucial. Another school which was facing difficult implementation problems was not as fortunate as the first school. Internal coordination and problem solving were poor, and the principal provided little support. He later resigned.

Where the principal was not committed to the innovation, few of the goals were implemented. Miles points out, as does the Rand Study, these important leadership roles of principals in the institutionalization phase. As Miles (1978b) reports,

> School leaders were very central in aiding institutionalization; though widely varying styles supported institutionalization, the leader's personal predictability (steadiness, non-capriciousness) seemed important.

Studies on Organizational Change. Researchers in the Program on Strategies for Organizational Change (SOC) at the University of Oregon's Center for Educational Policy and Management (CEPM) have been studying the processes of school improvement since 1967. In a number of their projects they speak to the importance of the principal in facilitating or restraining change efforts in schools. The results of their studies were summarized in their report (Runkel, Schmuck, Arends, and Francisco, 1979). They cite the importance of

1. Willingness of the administrator to support changes in the role of others by making reciprocal changes in his or her own role. (Change is much more difficult when the administrator says, "You go ahead and change, but don't ask me to do so.")

2. Degree of support given by administrators to the change project or to maintaining the present pattern of stability. (Giving support means giving some sort of resource: service, materials, money, information, status, or affection.)

3. Individuals' confidence that key administators will continue in position until at least a year after the target of the problem solving has been reached. (If too many members of a school believe the principal is likely to depart while the problem solving is under way or before it has become institutionalized, they will worry that the next principal may not support the work.)

In summary, a decade of research has given us some important information about the process of change in schools. Even though none of this research has focused directly on the role of the building principal in this process, all findings seem to indicate that, without the principal's active support and endorsement, almost any effort by outsiders will fail.

B. THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE AS VIEWED BY THEORISTS IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Just as a body of research evidence emphasizes the importance of the principal in school improvement efforts, theorists on administrative processes have also been concerned about the principal's role in implementing educational improvement. Miles (1964) points out that without the support of key administrators little chance of educational improvement exists. More recently, Lipham (1977) has written:

> The administrator is positioned at the critical confluence of the intraorganizational and extraorganizational forces which either foster or impede educational change and improvement. Although much has been written to date regarding the routine managerial aspects of the administrator's role, less has been said about the role of the administrator in fostering educational improvement; and still less is known about the unique linking functions of the local school administrator (p. 118).

Sarason (1971) concurs with Lipham when he states, "We begin with the principal because any kind of system change puts him in the role of implementing change in his school" (p. 111). A report (Amato, et. al., 1978) demonstrating the wide scope of principal responsibilities has identified 50 areas of responsibility corresponding to 12 different constituencies who are affected directly by the principal's behavior. Indeed, the principal is at the focal point of school change.

Gaye (1979) points out that principals must take a leadership role in instruction to compensate for reduction of resources for curriculum staff, to promote teacher effectiveness, and to provide a coherent high quality program for many different types of students. Principals must also take

leadership roles as organizational facilitators, as resource managers, and as business administrators.

C. ASSESSMENT OF PRINCIPAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

During the past two years, several agencies have surveyed principals themselves in attempts to determine important training needs (Latta, 1978; Callan, 1979). Items most often reported by principals include:

- skills in decision making
- conflict resolution techniques
- life planning for administrators
- procedures for improving school community relations
- evaluating instructional programs and personnel
- staff development and renewal
- improving school climate
- curriculum renewal and development
- staff evaluation
- dealing with discipline
- improving student learning
- curriculum improvement
- catalysts for promoting change
- working with parents, faculty and students
- instructional leadership

There were no examples from the literature on conceptual frameworks for viewing administrator inservice content and process. Some examples of actual needs assessments are available but the pickings are slim and the informational value of the results is questionable. Most of the needs are defined in abstract terms and the reader is often unclear about the reference group to which the training need is addressed, e.g., whether the need is identified as important to the respondent, to all principals, or to "other than me" principals.

We would be derelict in our review of literature on administrators inservice if we did not at least mention the conceptual work that has been completed on teacher inservice. Although empirical research on most of the proposed conceptual schemes is yet to come, there has been significant thought given to providing inservice for teachers (see for example Arends, Hersh and Turner, 1978).

III. Methodology

In "The Logic of the Case Study," Stake (1976) describes two types of case studies. In the first type, the issues are known and the case is selected as a context in which to explore the issues. In the second type, the case is given and the issues are discovered and studied as a way to learn about the case. Our study seemed to be of the first type. We were concerned about the role of the principal in supporting innovation and the nature of desirable inservice. We wanted to learn more about these issues by examining them in real situations.

But our method is hard to label. It was not ethnography, nor comprehensive case study, nor portrayal, nor even educational stories. We came to call each site description a "mini case study." The literature on ethnography, naturalistic inquiry and case study was used as a guideline. Our purpose was to gain familiarity with the phenomenon, gain new insights, and to discover additional research questions.

A. TRAINING FIELD RESEARCHERS

The 14 mini cases were completed by 10 researchers, some of who had never engaged in this type of field work. In a series of training meetings, the researchers learned some of the basic issues of methodology.

We identified our major purposes as understanding better the role of the principal in supporting externally-funded school-based innovations, discovering which skills and attitudes were needed, and exploring how they could be taught in inservice activities. We were especially interested in new ideas for the delivery of inservice training.

We used four sources in deciding on specific procedures: the field work guidelines proposed by Stake (1977), the methodology used in the NSF Science Multiple Case Study recently completed by Stake (1978), issues mentioned by Denny in "Story Telling and Educational Understanding" (1979), and Wolf's propositions for field work in museums (1978). Data collectors examined some safeguards against error given in Guba's monograph "Toward a Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry in Educational Evaluation" (1978). One problem we faced was defining limits--what are the rules for inclusion and exclusion? Other problems such as categories for data analysis and establishing authenticity (the counterpart of validity, reliability, and objectivity in social science inquiry) were addressed.

We read and discussed literature dealing specifically with methodology and with different concepts of the role of principal and the issues inherent in each. We decided upon interview protocols. We discussed the first two site visits in some detail to refine procedures for the remaining visits. Finally, we adopted a format for case descriptions, including ideas about the "nature of description" (Stake, 1978).

Field researchers spent an average of two days at each site. They conducted 79 interviews of 21 principals or administrative team members, 16 project staff workers, and 42 teachers. Case write-ups took an additional two or three days. On the whole, time commitments required to complete the case studies far exceeded the planning estimates.

The amount of literature about field work has increased as the respectability of naturalistic studies has increased. The complexities of this mode of inquiry, however, are enormous. Though our project was small, we encountered some of the difficulties Miles (1978a) has identified in larger studies. For example, a good field worker may not be a good writer or analyst. We discovered a need for "front-end" training. We ended up with

a data overload.

B. PROCEDURES FOR SITE SELECTION

In studying the issues, we wanted to be careful in selecting sites. We identified a number of criteria important in site selection. The external project had to be of sufficient magnitude and serve a specified target population (low-income or otherwise educationally disadvantaged students). The project had to have been functioning in the school for at least a year. The principal had to be willing to participate in our study. The principal or another member of the administrative team had to be involved in the project. The principal had to have been at the school for at least a year. We were also concerned with a few other parameters. Sites had to be distributed throughout the state and represent a variety of grades (from K to 12), types of projects, and settings (urban, suburban, rural).

We generated a list of potential sites by asking for suggestions from State Department of Education personnel and University personnel working with principals, as well as by examining a list of administrators who have adopted or adapted validated programs or who were known as leading an innovative school. More than 60 schools were on our initial list. First choosing on a random basis and then adjusting to reflect representation of all categories, we came up with 24 schools. Then we assigned field researchers and sought the necessary permissions from principals and school districts. We conducted 14 case studies to generate data for the cross-site analysis. Full case descriptions of eleven cases were written.

Our sample includes the largest and the smallest school districts in the state; 6 elementary, 4 middle and 4 high schools; and rural (6), suburban (2), and urban (6) settings. Projects represented in the sample ranged from simple to complex, and focused on areas from reading or physical education to special services for handicapped or disruptive students. We also selected projects to represent different geographical areas of the state. Eight projects were in the Willamette Valley--which contains the bulk of the state's population--while the remaining six projects were in other areas.

C. CROSS SITE ANALYSIS

Perhaps the most troublesome aspect of methodology for this study was the determination of how to do cross site analysis. We decided to have the two principal investigators do a content analysis of three case studies independently. They were to identify:

1. examples of behaviors exhibited by principal or members of the administrative team and seen as helpful by principal, project staff, or teachers ("real" behavior);

2. examples of behaviors seen as essential to the success of the project ("ideal" behavior); by "ideal" behaviors we mean ones which administators, project personnel, and

teachers thought would be critical to a project's success, even though those behaviors were not exhibited specifically in their project;

3. examples of unhelpful behaviors exhibited by principal or administrative team members and mentioned by principal, project staff, or teachers;

4. examples of recommended content and process for inservice activities for principals; and

5. problems, constraints, and opportunities affecting inservice options for principals.

The independent content analyses for these first cases were compared to determine inter-judge reliability at a gross level. Since these analyses were reasonably similar, the remaining cases were distributed between the two investigators for a single reading. The resultant lists of "real" helpful and unhelpful behaviors and "ideal" behaviors were then compiled on separate sheets. The first several "sorts" were done without the advance organization of a conceptual framework. Later, groups of like behaviors with a descriptor were compared with various conceptual schemes. Among these schemes were (1) management functions (planning, organizing, motivating, controlling), (2) stages of educational change (initiating, incorporating, implementing), and (3) organization development concepts (role clarification, norms).

D. LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

We can examine the methodology in light of the constraints of the study. The first constraint was the level of support. The budget was insufficient to cover the actual costs. However, we remain convinced that this type of study has an advantage over more traditional designs. In the future, we would budget more for such a study.

A second constraint was the different levels of experience of the field researchers. Although training was provided, skill in data collection and in writing case studies varied greatly from researcher to researcher.

A third constraint was time. Project commitments made earlier in the year kept us from implementing this one until late in the spring. The late start did not seem to affect our ability to get into schools, but it did affect the amount of time we had to reflect on our data.

IV. Results - Principal's Role and Behaviors

A. LIFE CYCLES OF FUNDED PROJECTS AND THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE

In our planning for this study, we did not specifically intend to look at the principal's role in relation to various phases of the project's life cycle. However, when we visited the site schools, we heard interviewees

use such phrases as "in the beginning, the principal..." or "when we were developing materials, the principal..." or "when the project was over, we...". We then decided to report findings according to the stages of the project's life cycle. These stages seemed to be: (1) planning and initiation, (2) building a temporary system for the project to operate, (3) developing and implementing, and (4) ending and institutionalization. We found that specific contributions by the principal at each stage are crucial to the project's success.

Planning and Initiation

The most successful projects we observed had principals who were intensely involved during the initial stage of the project's life. In one case, the principal decided after studying test scores that some low income kids in his school were losing as much as a year in reading during the summer months. His desire to do something about this problem prompted him to contact directly an acquaintance in a large oil company and negotiate a small sum of money for a special summer reading program. Once the money was acquired, he gained support from staff and others by speaking formally in faculty meetings and informally in every social event he attended. Before long he had others persuaded of the need for a summer program and had faculty actively planning for the program's implementation.

Every successful project did not command this much investment by the principal during the planning and initiation stage. However, successful projects did have principals who were involved to some extent in the beginning. It appears critical that principals agree with the basic concept, provide some input into the proposal itself, and begin communicating to others their support and enthusiasm.

Building a Temporary System

Some type of temporary sub-system must be set in place to plan and carry out a variety of project activities if proposed objectives are to be implemented. From the cases we observed, it is the principal's efforts and behavior during this stage of the project that most surely affect later successes or failure. Behaviors observed and reported to us across projects varied from intense active involvement on the part of some principals to permitting planners and others to carry out a set of start-up activities and then blocking, resisting or ignoring the project and its mission. As would be predicted, the most successful projects were those in which the principal took an active, positive role. Behaviors that seem to be critical in later success of the project included moving quickly and surely in hiring project staff if that was required, securing space that was central within the school, negotiating with the funding agency about budget and expectations involving project goals and activities, making financial arrangements with the central office or school board, selling the idea to the superintendent, facilitating ways budgeted monies could be expended with a minimum of red tape, convincing colleagues in other schools that the project deserved their support, and finally, facilitating the creation of groups of teachers and parents at the school that would begin to provide

specificity to project activities that had been spelled out in rather global terms in the proposal itself.

For example, one principal in the study was an old hand at obtaining special projects, understood their developmental nature, and had the skills to manage the set of complex tasks required at this stage. He was forceful with the funders, insisting on keeping his own autonomy but at the same time giving them what was promised. He knew the importance of finding good project staff; even when it required fighting with his central office superiors, he conducted a national search for one staff member. He also had unequaled skill in building teacher and parent groups that would actualize the vision he had for the project.

Development and Implementation

The third phase of the life cycle of externally-funded projects is that of the development and implementation of new practices. In most instances this stage included the creation of materials, testing a new teaching practice in pilot classrooms, and some type of inservice training for teachers or others expected to behave in new ways.

Again, the principals we observed seemed to vary in their involvement during this stage. Their involvement was influenced most by the size and complexity of the project and the school setting in which the project was located. For example, in the very small schools in our sample or in projects that had no monies for extra staff, principals were required, if the project was to proceed, to stay very much involved. The tasks they performed ranged from ordering materials needed or developing materials themselves to conducting inservice training for the teachers who were trying out the new practice or procedure. In larger schools and in projects in which a project staff was secured, the principal normally pulled away from the day-to-day involvement during this stage with few negative consequences. A pattern observed in successful projects was for the principal to remain interested and ready to problem-solve around obstacles that the project might encounter but to turn over the project's operation to project staff or other administrative personnel. Principals of successful projects, even if it was their idea in the beginning, seemed to know that at some point it was important to turn their "baby" over to others if the kind of development work that was needed was going to occur and if others were to develop ownership in implementation activities.

Ending and Institutionalization

Most of the funding agencies of the projects we studied were interested in improving school practices, not just during the life of the project itself but for times after the project ended and outside funding was withdrawn. Most called this institutionalization--making permanent something that is new. As was true with building the temporary system, the principal's behavior during this stage was critical. In almost every instance in which we studied a project that was near the end of its life or had ended, the principal decided what was to remain.

The critical behavior seemed to be the principal's commitment and ability to find resources to continue the new practice. For example, in the Teacher Corps project we studied, teachers and project staff all agreed that it was touch and go for some time whether the new curriculum that had been developed would remain in the school after the project was over. The critical forces were the principal's decision to retain it and her ability to persuade her department chairpersons to assign regular staff from her regular allotment to support the new curriculum. In this same project her leadership in writing a proposal to acquire new outside monies from a different funding agency was critical in continuing a community education program.

In summary, we found that while project staff can facilitate quality development and implementation activities, and teacher participation can insure that project activities will be carried out in the ways planners and funding agencies conceptualize them, if the project is to succeed, it is the action of the principal that is most crucial.

B. PRINCIPALS' BEHAVIOR THAT FACILITATES OR RESTRAINS PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

As we described in the previous section, there are some actions by principals that can determine the life and death of externally-funded projects at a school. However, to view the principal as all-powerful and the sole determiner of a project's fate is too simplistic. There are many other individuals and groups of actors who can also influence the ultimate success or failure of an innovative practice brought into a school. Among these are project staff, teachers, parents, central office personnel, members of the school board and citizens from the larger community. As these individuals and groups work toward school improvement in more or less productive ways, in each case we heard of behaviors of the principal that either facilitated or hindered the change process. These behaviors could be sorted into eight categories: (1) committing to the concept and vision of the project, (2) achieving role clarity, (3) negotiating with competing environmental pressures, (4) assuring involvement and participation, (5) using and allocating resources, (6) providing social support and displaying active participation, (7) understanding the content of the project, and (8) providing feedback and evaluation.

Committing to the Concept and Vision of the Project

By their very nature, projects aimed at bringing innovative practices into a school are somebody's idea about what's good and right. Similarly, change by its very nature is a challenge to authority and traditional ways of doing things. Project staff, teachers, and others must struggle to gain faculty acceptance of new ideas. We found that if the top administrator of the school does not share the project values, the proponents of the project may struggle in vain.

For example, in projects in which things were going smoothly and project goals were being accomplished, we heard over and over from project staff and teachers such statements as: "The principal is a strong advocate of

the project goals, the principal is positive about the program, the principal presented a positive image to staff on project objectives." On the other hand, we found projects in which the reports to us included such statements as: "The principal did not write the proposal and never really agreed with the idea; the principal was hired after the proposal was written, didn't like the project goals, and as did his predecessor, left after one year; and when the project is discussed the principal acts bored."

Achieving Role Clarity

We normally define role as a set of norms or shared expectations about the way an individual in a particular position is supposed to behave. Roles are shaped by reciprocal actions of various persons.

Because externally-funded projects are relatively new in schools, it was not surprising that we found a great deal of unclarity among various role holders--principals, project staff, and teachers--about the exact behaviors that principals should perform in relation to the project. Essentially these reports and concerns fell into three categories: role confusion, role conflict, and lack of clarity about leadership style.

In some projects, principals themselves reported feeling confused and uncomfortable about their role in relation to the project. In one instance, the principal wanted to be involved andd helpful, but was fearful that taking too active a part would undermine the efforts of the project director. In another instance, the principal reported that she was never certain how she was supposed to behave and always felt unsure of herself during visits from the project's program monitor.

In several projects we heard about role conflict, particularly from teachers and project staff when they felt that the principal was performing his or her role poorly. These were comments such as: "The principal allowed administrative requirements to compete with project needs, the principal is not accessible to project staff, the principal had too many other demands on his time, the principal never came to any of our meetings."

We also heard reports from site personnel about unclarity of the principal's leadership style. In projects where this was a problem, sometimes we were told that the principal was too authoritarian: "He mandated participation in the project in the face of staff resistance, his authoritarian style inhibited some people's involvement, he did all the goal setting for the planning day, the principal was autocratic, unsupportive and less than tactful." At other times we were told that the principal's leadership style was too laissez-faire: "He provided teachers too much latitude in implementation, he exhibited a style that allowed teachers to do their own thing."

We also found projects in which people were very satisfied with the principal's leadership style regardless of whether it was authoritarian or laissez-fair. Staff comments such as "The principal tells the staff where she

is, they are always clear, the principal told us he was going to retain financial responsibility and did, the principal turned things over to the project staff but was there to support if support was needed." Probably no particular style is best suited for facilitating externally-funded projects, but clarity and steadiness are essential.

Negotiating with Competing Environmental Pressures

In the more successful projects, we heard comments describing the ways principals gained support from competing environmental pressures: "The principal provided training and orientation to community volunteers, the principal conducted a series of 'low key' awareness sessions with parents, the principal formed a group of interested teachers prior to funding, the principal worked with the district specialist on planning the steps needed for implementation, the principal went to bat with the Board of Education, the principal attempted to obtain political support from other principals on the curriculum reform, the principal spent 80-90 percent of his time during the first year doing public relations work for the project."

As with other behaviors, we found some principals who excelled in their performance and others who did not. The talented principals seemed to have a special sense for getting groups of parents involved in discussion and taking active involvement in the project. They knew their way around the district and could get on the phone and speak to the right people in the central office when some roadblock had been set up. They could sell teacher groups and others on the importance of the externally-funded project.

It appeared to us that these actions were critical in facilitating the smooth progression of the project from plans spelled out in the proposal to ultimate implementation and institutionalization.

Assuring Involvement and Participation

Getting synergistic action to occur between project staff, teachers, and others taxed the abilities of most of the principals we observed. Principal behaviors that site personnel saw as facilitative were reported as: "The principal encouraged faculty participation in providing direction for the project, the principal explained to regular faculty how the project benefits them, the principal encouraged participation in inservice events, the principal facilitated staff visits to other schools, the principal selected unit leaders and helped them develop and operate as a team, the principal allowed staff to own problems with the program, the principal involved staff in joint decisions to bring the project into the school."

At other times we heard these comments in other projects: "The principal did not encourage (or require) teacher participation, the principal accepted teacher resistance and even encouraged it, the principal did not seek teacher involvement until after the project was well under way."

It appears to us that principals can either faciltate or restrain project goal accomplishment by the degree to which they advocate the project

to adverse groups and critics and the degree to which they can win teacher support and involvement.

Using and Allocating Resources

A critical set of behaviors, particularly as perceived by project staff and teachers, was the way principals used and allocated resources. This included resources from the project itself and other resources in the school or the district that they had some authority to use.

On the facilitating side we heard: "The principal obtained monies from the district to hire a team of teachers to write the proposal, the principal persuaded the publisher to conduct a free inservice for the teachers, the principal convinced the district's business office to simplify the paperwork that would facilitate hiring, the principal anticipated material and equipment needs and had them on hand, the principal shortened the school day twice a month and used the time for planning, the principal found non-project funds for teachers to visit other schools."

On the other hand, in schools where projects were running less smoothly, we often heard reports about the way principals' use and allocation of resources had a restraining effect on the project. For example: "The principal did not seek the district resources (such as time and space) needed to support the project, the principal assigned the project to a room in a wing of the building that was not accessible, the principal did not give special administrative favors to help project implementation."

Providing Social Support and Active Participation

From our observations of the projects, the set of behaviors most often mentioned and observed that facilitate or restrain project activities were what we have termed providing social support and active participation. These behaviors ranged all the way from supplying resources and materials at critical times to providing a hug at a difficult moment.

Behaviors that were facilitative were reported to us as: "The principal built trust with the total faculty, the principal served as a sounding board for the project staff, the principal ran interference for project staff with the central office, the principal served as an advisor and helper if problems occurred, the principal recognized outstanding contributions of faculty members and gave them strokes, the principal gave personal support to the project director, gatherings with project staff and representatives of the funding agency to give visibility to the project and express thanks for help, the principal showed up at meetings when she was needed, the principal attended all the inservices for teachers."

C. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

We found that the projects we studied had definite life cycles and that different kinds of principal behaviors were critical in each. A variety of kinds of behavior and styles of leadership seem to be effective, depending

on the nature of the project, the principal's preferences, and the wishes of other project participants. Some degree of involvement by the principal is essential, perhaps mainly to signal to others that the project is viewed as an important part of the school's program. At the outset, principals have to decide their degree of commitment to the project and the amount of energy they are willing to devote to it. This information becomes an extremely critical basis on which to make a decision about whether to proceed with the project.

V. Results - Administrator Inservice

As we described, the principals in the cases we observed were a critical force in determining whether an externally-funded change project was to succeed or to fail. Furthermore, principals, project staff, and teachers could report--in fact in great detail--the behaviors of principals that facilitated a project effort in a school. They were equally capable of describing behaviors of principals that hindered acomplishment of project goals and in some instances even mentioned actions that could effectively block project activities envisioned by planners and coordinators.

Even though the helpful behaviors can be clearly reported, observed, and described, it does not follow that they can be easily taught. A principal's abilities to understand the developmental nature of change projects, to set up temporary sub-systems, to achieve role clarity, to assure involvement and participation, and to provide social support and participation require a set of extremely complex behaviors. To perform many of these activities requires not only conceptual understanding of the behavior but also skill in actually doing it. It also requires knowing the effect of the behavior in general terms and appropriateness of the behavior in a specific setting, with a specific person, at a specific point in time in the project's history.

We discussed these issues with principals, project staff, and teachers in the schools we visited. We attempted to find out about the type of staff development activities for principals that had been associated with the project and how these worked. If none were available, we asked what kind of training or developmental experiences they thought would have been helpful. We also asked interviewees about past staff development experiences for principals and their strengths and weaknesses. Finally, we asked interviewees to make recommendations about future training or experiences (content and delivery) that would assist the principal to speak with more wisdom about the processes of change in educational settings and to act more facilitatively when managing externally-funded projects in schools.

Almost every interviewee had difficulty with our questions about in-service education for principals. Many did not seem to be answering the questions we asked. An immediate response was either to give us ideas for teacher inservice or to make suggestions on how a principal can provide effective inservice for teachers. This lack of reference to development and professional growth of the administrator may have been a reflection of problems with the interview schedule, but we think it probably mirrors the lack of thought and emphasis that

have been given to what administrators need.

We were also somewhat amazed and perhaps disappointed that--even after probing principals themselves--the most frequently mentioned topics for administrator development seemed to us to reflect an interest in current "fads" such as time management, implications of 94-142, and so on, rather than careful thought about the larger issues, for example about the type of training that would help administrators perform the complex set of behaviors associated with the principal's position and the best ways of delivering that training to them.

The analysis of responses to questions revealed several problems. First, inservice activities associated with projects did not, in general, deal with issues identified in our study. In no case were inservice activities specifically developed to assist the administrator with responsibility of the project. Second, past staff development and training experiences were limited in range and not relevant to specific administrative skills. They were perceived as inadequate. Third, recommendations for future inservice did not cover critical behaviors exhibited by principals with successful projects.

REFLECTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the limitations of suggestions provided by principals and other site personnel, we used, in addition to the case data, a larger base of information from which to derive recommendations. This base includes evidence from the review of literature on change and the role of principals, our inferences about what needs to be done to insure that principals can perform the facilitative behaviors discussed earlier, and our experience in working with teachers and principals in other projects.

This body of evidence suggests that

(1) staff development efforts should be responsive to local conditions and individualized to specific principal's abilities,

(2) the principal must be treated as a colleague who is capable of describing his or her inservice needs,

(3) the consultant or trainer should provide experiences that respond to these stated needs rather than make the assumption that she or he already knows what the principal needs. For example, a principal may wish to improve his or her skills in conducting faculty meetings, or in interacting with computers, or in ways of locating community resources for teachers, depending on which aspect of the principal's role is most salient.

Within the general framework of inservice for principals, specific activities are needed.

(1) A set of materials and strategies on "Administering Change

in Schools" that could be adapted for local or regional seminars for principals in schools with externally-funded projects should be developed and circulated.

(2) Agencies that fund improvement projects should cooperate in providing funds for staff development for principals in site schools.

(3) A peer support system should be developed for principals in schools with special projects.

(4) A set of job aids, such as worksheets, check lists, and self-instruction exercises, should be developed for principals who have special projects in their shcools.

Principals who must administer externally-funded change projects in their schools comprise a distinct audience for providers of inservice training. As such, they have special responsibilities and special needs that cannot be met by traditional methods of inservice education. Providing funds and other resources for principal inservice and adopting the perspective of a developmental model which responds to their needs and provides appropriate experiences in a flexible manner offers a great deal of promise for assisting the principals who carry this special responsibility.

REFERENCES

Abramowitz, Susan and Ellen Tenenbaum. High School '77 A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals, NIE. December, 1978.

Ama[illegible], Ted, et al. "The Changing Role of the Principal." Mimeo, April, 1978.

Arends, R. I., Hersh, R., and Turner, J. "Inservice Education and the Six O'Clock News". Theory Into Practice, Volume XVII, Number 3, June, 1978.

Berman, Paul and McLaughlin, M.W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV: The Findings in Review. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1975.

Callan, M.F. "Summary of Administrative Inservice Needs Survey." Mimeo, Eugene, Oregon: Eugene Public Schools, 1979.

Denny, Terry. "Story Telling and Educational Understanding." Occasional Paper Series, Number 8, Western Michigan Evaluation Center, 1979.

Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. I - VII. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1975.

Fullan, Michael and Alan Pomfret. "Research on Curriculum and Instructional Implementation." Review of Educational Research. Winter, 1977.

Gaye, G. "Curriculum and the School Principal." In C. C. Wersberg (Ed.), Chicago Principals Reporter, Chicago: Chicago Principals Association, 1979.

Guba, Egon. Toward a Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry in Educational Evaluation. Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Evaluation, UCLA, 1978.

Latta, F. "A Synopsis of the California Teacher Corps Network Survey: The Inservice Needs of Teacher Corps Building Principals." Mimeo, San Diego, California: San Diego State University, Department of Educational Administration, 1978.

Lipham, J. M. "The Administrator's Role in Educational Linkage." In Nash, N. and J. Culbertson, Linking Processes In Educational Improvement, Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1977.

Mann, Dale. "Design Specifications for a User-Proven, Federally Supported System of School Improvement." Mimeo, Columbia University, 1976.

Miles, M. B. (a) "Ethnographic Methods and Their Problems." Mimeo, November 24, 1978.

Miles, M. B. (b) "Executive Summary, Project on Social Architecture in Education." Mimeo, New York: Center for Policy Research, 1978.

Miles, M.B. Innovation in Education. New York: Columbia University Teacher College, 1964.

Newsweek, March 13, 1978. Summary of study by National Assoc. of Secondary School Principals.

Runkel, P. J., R. A. Arends, J. Arends, and R. P. Francisco, Transforming the School's Capacity for Problem Solving. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, 1979.

Sarason, S.B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Scriven, M. and J. Roth. "Needs Assessment: Concept and Practice." In Anderson, Scarvia B. New Directions for Program Evaluation: Exploring Purposes and Dimensions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1978.

Stake, Robert E. Field Work Guidelines (unpublished paper, CIRCE), University of Illinois, 1977.

Stake, Robert E. The Logic of the Case Study (unpublished paper, CIRCE), University of Illinois, March, 1976.

Stake, Robert E., and Jack A. Easley. Case Studies in Science Education, Booklet O, Chapter C, Methodology of the Project. University of Illinois, January, 1978.

Summary and Analysis of the Ten Teacher Corps Questions on Principal Training Needs. Mimeo, 1978.

Summary of Needs Survey for Confederation of Oregon School Administrators Personnel Growth Program. Mimeo, 1978.

Wolf, Robert, and Barbara L. Tymitz. "A Preliminary Guide for Conducting Natural Inquiry in Studying Museum Environments." Mimeo, Indiana Center for Evaluation, Indiana University, 1978.